Semitic Originals of the Gospels: Evaluating Aramaic and Hebrew Primacy Scholarship

Overview

The question of whether any of the canonical Gospels were originally composed in Aramaic or Hebrew — rather than in the Koine Greek of our earliest manuscripts — sits at the intersection of linguistics, textual criticism, patristics, and historical Jesus studies. The scholarly consensus firmly holds that the canonical Gospels, as we possess them, are original Greek compositions. Yet the consensus is not a simple dismissal of Semitic influence; rather, it is a nuanced recognition that (1) Jesus and his earliest disciples spoke Aramaic (and possibly Hebrew) as their primary language(s), (2) oral traditions and perhaps even some early written sources behind the Gospels may have been Aramaic or Hebrew, and (3) the Semitic thought-world of the authors permeates the Greek text in profound ways — without this constituting evidence that the Gospels *as literary compositions* were written in anything other than Greek. This report surveys the major scholarly positions, their evidential bases, and the decisive arguments that constrain how far "Semitic primacy" claims can responsibly be pressed.

I. The Language Environment of First-Century Palestine

Any evaluation of Semitic-original hypotheses must begin with a clear-eyed picture of the multilingual landscape of Roman Palestine. The Dead Sea Scrolls have been decisive here: they demonstrate that first-century Judea was genuinely trilingual, with Aramaic, Hebrew, and Greek all in active use — at different social levels, for different purposes.[1][2]

- **Aramaic** was the dominant vernacular for everyday speech among Palestinian Jews, a legacy of Persian imperial administration from the sixth century BCE onward. Josephus A. Fitzmyer, one of the foremost Aramaic scholars of the twentieth century, regarded Aramaic as "the dominant language" while acknowledging bilingualism was widespread. The Dead Sea Scrolls include Jewish Palestinian Aramaic texts (ca. 200 BCE–200 CE) and the Bar Kokhba letters confirm it was still the spoken vernacular in the second century CE.[3][2] [^1]
- **Hebrew** was by no means dead, a point frequently obscured in older scholarship. The Dead Sea Scrolls are *predominantly* Hebrew, including non-liturgical compositions and communal documents. Epigraphic finds from Masada and elsewhere, as well as Mishnaic Hebrew, demonstrate that Hebrew was a spoken language in sectarian and possibly wider Jewish circles during the first century. Randall Buth and others at the Biblical Language Center have argued Hebrew was more widely spoken in Judea proper than a generation of scholarship following Dalman recognized.[4][2] [5][6] [^1]
- **Greek** was the language of commerce, administration, and wider communication throughout the Eastern Mediterranean since the Hellenistic period. Josephus and Philo wrote in Greek; synagogue dedications and ossuary inscriptions appear in Greek across

Palestine; and Fitzmyer concluded that Greek was likely understood even by artisans and tradesmen in first-century Galilee.[^7]

This multilingual setting means the linguistic question cannot be settled by appeal to background cultural assumptions alone. Greek was a thoroughly plausible compositional language for Jewish authors addressing communities across the Roman world.

II. The Major Scholarly Positions

A. Total Aramaic Primacy (Peshitta Primacy)

The most extreme form of the Semitic-original hypothesis holds that the entire New Testament — or at minimum all four Gospels — was originally composed in Aramaic, and that our Greek texts are translations of this Aramaic original. This view is associated primarily with **George Lamsa** (1892–1975), whose translation of the Peshitta (*The Holy Bible from Ancient Eastern Manuscripts*, 1957) popularized the claim in English-speaking Christianity, and with the **Assyrian Church of the East**, which maintains Peshitta primacy as a confessional position.[8][9]

The Lamsa-Peshitta position has been thoroughly rejected by mainstream scholarship for the following reasons:

1. **Lamsa's linguistic competence was compromised.** Both contemporaries and later scholars found that he frequently conflated modern Syriac with first-century Palestinian Aramaic — two substantially different dialects separated by centuries of linguistic evolution. His claimed "corrections" (e.g., rendering Matthew 19:24's "camel" as "rope," based on the Aramaic *gamla*) rely on a lexical ambiguity present in the Aramaic *word* but provide no proof that the Greek texts derive from an Aramaic exemplar.[10][11] [^8]
2. **The Peshitta is demonstrably a translation from Greek.** Textual scholars have identified clear evidence that the Syriac Peshitta New Testament was translated from Greek, not vice versa. The Peshitta NT contains the marks of a translation — vocabulary constrained by Greek source words, grammatical patterns reflecting Greek Vorlagen — rather than the characteristics of an original composition. Syriac scholars broadly affirm that the Peshitta OT is a translation from Hebrew and the NT from Greek.[12][13] [^8]
3. **The Old Syriac versions confirm Greek priority.** The Curetonian (5th cent.) and Sinaitic Palimpsest (late 4th cent.) manuscripts, the oldest surviving Syriac Gospel texts, already reflect a text dependent on Greek. The later Peshitta standardized this tradition. There are no competing Aramaic manuscripts that antedate the earliest Greek papyri.[14][15]
4. **Theological distortions in Lamsa's work.** Reviewers noted that Lamsa's translation, presented as correcting Greek "mistranslations," subtly altered passages touching on the Trinity and the deity of Christ — undermining confidence that the project was purely philological.[^8]

The Peshitta Primacy thesis currently enjoys no notable support in academic New Testament scholarship.[^16]

B. Selective Aramaic Source Hypotheses (The Mainstream Scholarly Position)

A far more carefully argued and widely respected position holds not that the Gospels themselves were originally Aramaic, but that **underlying oral traditions and some early written sources** circulated in Aramaic, and that the Greek evangelists translated or adapted this material. This position is entirely consistent with Greek compositional primacy and has been developed by some of the twentieth century's most eminent scholars.

Matthew Black's *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts* (1st ed. 1946; 3rd ed. 1967) is the foundational work of this tradition. Black documented Aramaic grammatical features (syntax, vocabulary), poetic structures (parallelism, alliteration), and untranslatable wordplay in the sayings of Jesus, arguing that this demonstrates an Aramaic background for at least the discourse material of the Gospels. Black's work remained the standard starting point for all subsequent inquiry.[17][18] [^19]

Maurice Casey pressed this thesis further with greater methodological rigor. In *Aramaic Sources of Mark's Gospel* (1998) and *An Aramaic Approach to Q* (2002), Casey argued that the author of Mark used *written* Aramaic sources dating within a decade or two of the crucifixion, and that Q material in Matthew and Luke reflects divergent translations of a common Aramaic source. Casey's eight methodological principles for reconstructing Aramaic Vorlagen — published in a Cambridge University Press monograph — were a serious scholarly contribution, though his specific reconstructions have been criticized for being too speculative. The broader insight — that Q may have been an Aramaic document translated differently by different evangelists — is taken seriously even by those who question his specifics.[20][21] [22][23]

The key evidence for *some* Aramaic source-layer includes:

- **Preserved Aramaic words in the Greek text:** *Talitha qum* (Mk 5:41), *Ephphatha* (Mk 7:34), *Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachthani* (Mk 15:34), *Abba* (Mk 14:36), *Maranatha* (1 Cor 16:22). If the Gospels were wholesale translations from Aramaic, these phrases would have been rendered into Greek like everything else; their retention within otherwise Greek narrative suggests the authors were *quoting* remembered Aramaic originals, not translating a complete Aramaic text.[^24]
- **Semitic wordplay that survives translation:** John the Baptist's saying about "stones" (*'abanim*) and "children" (*banim*) in Matthew 3:9 makes poetic sense only in a Semitic language[^24]. The ambiguity between *dakko* ("cleanse") and *zakko* ("give alms") explains the Matthew/Luke divergence in the cup-cleansing saying (Matt 23:26 || Luke 11:41)[^24].
- **Translation variants between Synoptics**: The "Sermon on the Mount/Plain" difference and other divergences between Matthew and Luke are explicable as independent renderings of a shared Aramaic source, a point Casey argued at length.[^23]

Crucially, however, even scholars who accept Aramaic sources consistently distinguish this from Aramaic *composition* of the canonical Gospels. The Semitic features are concentrated in the sayings tradition; the narrative framework consistently displays the features of original Greek writing.[16][24]

C. The Hebrew Gospel Hypothesis

A distinct tradition argues for a Hebrew (not Aramaic) source behind at least the Synoptic tradition. The patristic testimony about Matthew's logia "in the Hebrew dialect" (*Hebraïdi dialektō*) has been interpreted by some as pointing to a genuine Hebrew composition, rather than an Aramaic one — especially since post-Dead Sea Scroll research has demonstrated that Hebrew was a living language in first-century Palestine, and the Church Fathers' use of "Hebrew" may genuinely mean the Hebrew language rather than Aramaic.

James R. Edwards of Whitworth University argued in *The Hebrew Gospel and the Development of the Synoptic Tradition* (Eerdmans, 2009) that Luke depended on a Hebrew Gospel known to the early church — not on the hypothetical Greek document Q — along with Mark. Edwards marshaled the combined weight of patristic testimony (twenty or more Church Fathers over nine centuries who refer to a Hebrew Gospel), the distinctively Semitic character of Luke's special material, and the implausibility of Q as an unattested document. The DTS review praised Edwards' "tightly woven, disciplined scholarship" while noting the patristic references are "far from clear" and the Ebionite/Nazarene Gospels were typically associated with heterodox communities.[25][26][^27]

George Howard's analysis of the Shem Tob *Even Bohan* Hebrew Matthew (a 14th-century polemical text) argued that the embedded Hebrew Matthew reflected transmission from earlier Jewish-Christian scribes and was not simply a retrotranslation from Latin or Greek. Howard identified numerous readings in Shem Tob's text that diverge from all known Greek, Latin, and Syriac witnesses in ways difficult to explain as translation variants, concluding that the text preserves ancient Hebrew readings. However, William Petersen's careful textual analysis challenged Howard's dating and genetic argument, presenting evidence that the Shem Tob text reflects influences from medieval Latin and vernacular sources, pointing to a late medieval origin for the manuscript tradition rather than a primitive Hebrew original.[28][29][30][31]

Randall Buth and the Biblical Language Center have argued specifically for Hebrew — rather than Aramaic — as Jesus' primary teaching language, based on epigraphic and papyrological evidence and a careful re-examination of what the NT itself labels *Hebraisti* ("in Hebrew"). This is a legitimate minority position with genuine evidential grounding, though it is contested.[6][32]

III. The Major Arguments Against Aramaic/Hebrew Compositional Primacy

The scholarly consensus that the canonical Gospels are original Greek compositions rests on several converging lines of evidence that have not been overturned:

1. The Manuscript Tradition

There are over 5,000 Greek New Testament manuscripts, papyri, and fragments, beginning from the second century CE. There are zero ancient Hebrew manuscripts of any Gospel, and no ancient Aramaic manuscripts competing chronologically with the earliest Greek papyri. The Syriac versions (Diatessaron, Old Syriac, Peshitta) all post-date the earliest Greek

witnesses. This does not by itself prove Greek priority — arguments from silence are legitimate in both directions — but the manuscript situation is a powerful evidential asymmetry that advocates of Semitic originals must address and largely cannot.[33][34][35][36][12][24]

2. LXX Dependence in the Gospels

The Gospel writers repeatedly quote the Old Testament in forms that follow the Greek Septuagint *rather than* the Hebrew (or Aramaic Targum) when the two traditions diverge. Matthew 2:20 uses the exact vocabulary of Exodus 4:19 LXX; Matthew 24:45–47 combines two passages verbatim from Genesis 39:4–5 LXX; Hebrews 10:5 cites Psalm 40:6 using the Greek "body" rather than the Hebrew "ears," and the entire theological argument depends on the Greek reading. These LXX dependencies are not casual or superficial; they are foundational to the literary and theological structure of the texts. A translator from Aramaic would have no reason to adopt divergent LXX readings over the Hebrew — such usage is the signature of an *author composing in Greek*.[37][38][^24]

3. The Greek Texts Do Not Look Like Translations

Scholars now possess an extensive knowledge of what Jewish translation *from* Hebrew and Aramaic *into* Greek looks like, because we have both sides of the equation for the Septuagint translations and other Hellenistic Jewish works. Translations consistently mirror their source texts' simple syntax, use a restricted range of vocabulary conventionally mapped to Semitic terms, and maintain consistent translation technique throughout. The canonical Gospels do not display these characteristics: they contain complex Greek sentences, a diverse vocabulary of particles and idioms with no Semitic equivalents, and crucially, *variable* Semitic influence — heavy in the sayings of Jesus and light in the surrounding Greek narrative. This differential distribution is precisely what one would expect from a *Greek author incorporating Semitic source material*, not from a translator rendering a uniformly Aramaic text.[^24]

4. Synoptic Interdependence in Greek

The textual relationships among the Synoptic Gospels — the verbatim and near-verbatim agreements spanning sometimes dozens of consecutive Greek words, including in narrative and transitional passages — are most naturally explained by direct literary dependence in Greek. The dominant solution (Markan priority with Matthew and Luke using Mark's Greek) means that if Matthew is a translation of a Semitic original, that "original" must have incorporated enormous blocks of Mark's Greek. This logical entanglement has not been satisfactorily resolved by Semitic-primacy advocates.[37][24]

5. Greek-Specific Wordplay in the Gospels

Certain passages display literary or rhetorical features that work only in Greek, suggesting original composition rather than translation. The most prominent example is John 3, where the dialogue between Jesus and Nicodemus pivots on the double meaning of *anothen* — "from above" or "again" — a wordplay that is entirely lost in any Semitic language and would make

the dialogue incoherent in an Aramaic original. Similar Greek-specific features appear elsewhere in the Fourth Gospel.[^24]

6. The Pauline Epistles and Acts

For completeness: though the scope of Semitic-original claims has usually been restricted to the Gospels (or Matthew in particular), the remainder of the New Testament presents an even stronger case for original Greek composition. Paul wrote explicitly to Gentile Greek-speaking churches in Greek cities, in a sophisticated Greek epistolary style with demonstrable rhetorical training. Luke–Acts is dedicated to a Greek-named patron (*Theophilos*), positions itself within Greek historiographical conventions, and is written at a relatively elevated stylistic level. These works have never plausibly been argued to be translations.[35][24]

IV. The Patristic Testimony: What the Fathers Actually Said

The patristic tradition is the strongest plank in the Hebrew/Aramaic-original argument, and it deserves careful analysis rather than dismissal. Papias (c. AD 60–130), preserved by Eusebius (*HE* 3.39.16), wrote: "Matthew composed the *logia* in the Hebrew dialect, and each interpreted them as best he could." This is then echoed — almost certainly in dependence on Papias — by Irenaeus (*Adv. Haer.* 3.1.1), Origen (in Eusebius *HE* 6.25), Eusebius himself (*HE* 3.24), Jerome, Augustine, and Epiphanius. This is not a trivial tradition — it spans over three centuries and multiple independent witnesses.[39][40] [41][42] [^33]

However, several critical observations substantially limit its probative force:

- **The meaning of *logia* is contested.** The word can mean "sayings/oracles" or more broadly "accounts/narratives." If Papias meant only that Matthew compiled a *collection of Jesus' sayings* (like a sayings source), then his statement cannot be pressed to mean that the canonical Gospel of Matthew was composed in Hebrew. This interpretation — that Papias' *logia* refers to a pre-Gospel sayings collection, not the canonical Gospel — has been argued by many modern scholars.[41][39]
- **"Hebrew dialect" may mean Aramaic.** In ancient usage, *Hebraïdi dialektō* is sometimes used to denote the Aramaic vernacular of Palestinian Jews rather than Biblical Hebrew. Scholars including Fitzmyer have argued this ambiguity is genuine and unresolvable from the text alone.[^4]
- **The chain of witnesses likely derives from Papias.** Irenaeus explicitly quotes Papias or depends on him; subsequent fathers mostly repeat the tradition without independent access to a Hebrew Matthew. There is a difference between five independent witnesses and one witness cited repeatedly.[43][41]
- **No Church Father demonstrably used a Hebrew Matthew.** Jerome was sent to the Holy Land specifically to find original-language texts, came across a Nazarene/Ebionite Gospel in Aramaic, initially thought it might be the original Matthew, but ultimately translated his Latin version from the canonical Greek. At one point he even cited a saying from this Gospel that appears to be *dependent on* the canonical Greek Matthew, not antecedent to it. This is devastating for the claim that a Semitic original was accessible in the patristic period.[42][24]

- **The "Gospel according to the Hebrews" is not canonical Matthew.** Patristic references to a Semitic gospel probably refer to one or more distinct apocryphal works — the Gospel of the Nazarenes, the Gospel of the Ebionites, and the Gospel of the Hebrews — none of which is clearly identifiable with canonical Matthew. These works are associated with heterodox Jewish-Christian communities, and the fact that heretical groups claimed their text was the "original" Hebrew Matthew carries evidential weight in neither direction.[44] [42]
- **Eusebius' account of Pantaenus finding Matthew in India** is of doubtful historical value, and even Eusebius treated it with notable caution.[43][24]

The honest conclusion: the patristic tradition provides a genuine, non-trivial witness that *something* connected to Matthew circulated in a Semitic language in the early church. It cannot, however, sustain the inference that the canonical Gospel of Matthew as we have it was an Aramaic or Hebrew composition. The tradition is ambiguous in its meaning, probably dependent on a single source (Papias), and contradicted by the internal evidence of the canonical text itself.

V. Special Case: The Shem Tob Hebrew Matthew

George Howard's analysis of the Hebrew Matthew preserved in Shem Tob ben Shaprut's 14th-century *Even Bohan* (a Jewish polemical work) represents perhaps the most serious recent attempt to recover an early Hebrew text of Matthew. Howard identified readings in this Hebrew text that diverge from all known Greek, Latin, and Syriac manuscripts in ways he argued could not be explained as secondary translations. He concluded Shem Tob received an ancient text through a chain of Jewish scribal transmission.[29][30] [31][28]

The critical scholarly response has been mixed to skeptical. William Petersen's detailed review (*TC Online*, 1998) found evidence of medieval influences — including Latin vernacular and Byzantine Greek traditions — in the Shem Tob text inconsistent with a genuinely ancient provenance. The consensus is that Shem Tob's Hebrew Matthew, however interesting for the history of Jewish-Christian relations and Hebrew philology, does not provide access to a first-century Hebrew Gospel. Its unusual readings are more convincingly explained as the product of a medieval Jewish polemical tradition creatively adapted from existing Vulgate and Byzantine sources.[29][24]

VI. Methodological Issues in Aramaic Source Reconstruction

The sub-field of Aramaic source reconstruction has faced sustained methodological criticism. Fitzmyer himself, in a programmatic essay on methodology in the study of the Aramaic substratum, warned that scholars frequently labeled evidence as "Aramaic" when it was merely "Semitic" in general — or even specifically Hebrew — a conflation that distorts conclusions about which language underlies specific passages. He noted that pre-Dead Sea Scroll scholarship had worked from an extremely thin evidential base, drawing on Targums, Babylonian Talmud texts, and Syriac sources of much later date as though they transparently represented first-century Galilean Aramaic.[45][46] [^4]

The post-1947 situation is better, with the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls, the Bar Kokhba letters, and the Genesis Apocryphon providing more reliable first-century Palestinian Aramaic comparative data. But the field remains constrained by:[47][45]

1. The **absence of a clear methodology** for distinguishing genuine Aramaic translation-features from the Semitized Greek of bilingual authors writing in a Septuagintal idiom. [^45]
2. The risk of **circular reconstruction**: positing an Aramaic source to explain a difficulty, then using the reconstructed source as evidence for Aramaic origins.
3. The problem of **dialect specificity**: the Aramaic of Qumran, of the Targums, of Syriac Christianity, and of the Bar Kokhba period vary considerably; it is not always clear which dialect would have been used in first-century Galilee or Judea.[^45]

Maurice Casey's methodological framework (eight criteria for source reconstruction) represented a genuine advance, but reviewers — including those broadly sympathetic to an Aramaic substratum — found his specific reconstructions frequently strained and dependent on speculative back-translations.[21][23]

VII. A Summary Evaluation

Claim	Evidential Status	Scholarly Assessment
Jesus primarily spoke Aramaic	Strong	Near-universal consensus[1][48]
Hebrew was also spoken in 1st-cent. Palestine	Moderate–Strong	Widely accepted post-DSS[2][6]
Jesus' sayings were transmitted in Aramaic orally	Strong	Mainstream position[^24]
Some early *written* Aramaic sources behind Gospels	Plausible	Held by many scholars (Casey, Black, etc.)[17][20]
Matthew wrote a Semitic *logia* (sayings source)	Possible	Based on Papias; meaning disputed[39][33]
Hebrew Gospel used by Luke (Edwards' thesis)	Minority/Speculative	Intriguing but not established[25][26]
Complete canonical Gospels originally in Aramaic	No credible support	Rejected; manuscript, LXX, and internal evidence decisive[8][16][^24]
Peshitta Primacy (NT originally Aramaic)	Fringe	No academic support; Peshitta demonstrably secondary[8][12][^13]
Shem Tob Hebrew Matthew preserves ancient text	Disputed/Unlikely	Probably medieval retranslation[29][24]

Conclusion

The scholarly evaluation of Semitic-original Gospels theory requires separating several distinct claims that advocates sometimes bundle together. That the *language of Jesus*, the *oral tradition behind the Gospels*, and perhaps some *pre-Gospel written sources* were Aramaic (and possibly Hebrew) is not seriously disputed and indeed finds compelling internal evidence in the preserved Aramaic words of Jesus, the Semitic wordplay in the sayings tradition, and the translation variants among the Synoptics. This is a legitimate and productive area of research.[17][24]

What the evidence does not support — and the linguistic, manuscript, and literary arguments decisively weigh against — is the claim that the canonical Gospels *as literary compositions* were originally written in Aramaic or Hebrew. The pervasive dependence of the Gospel authors on LXX readings (including where these diverge from the Hebrew), the characteristics of original composition rather than translation in their Greek, the Synoptic interdependence in Greek, and the total absence of any competing Semitic manuscript tradition collectively constitute an overwhelming case for Greek compositional priority.[34][8] [^24]

The most credible territory for future research lies between these poles: rigorous, methodologically controlled investigation of the Aramaic source-layer behind the sayings of Jesus, taking full advantage of the post-Dead Sea Scroll evidence base, without conflating that substratum with claims about the language of the canonical texts themselves. James Edwards' Hebrew Gospel hypothesis and Maurice Casey's Aramaic source reconstruction, whatever their individual weaknesses, represent this kind of serious scholarly engagement with the Semitic background. The popular Aramaic Primacy and Peshitta Primacy movements, by contrast, typically rest on Lamsa's conflation of Syriac with Galilean Aramaic, on uncritical acceptance of patristic testimony, and on the romanticization of Aramaic as the "original language of Jesus" — a category error that conflates the *language Jesus spoke* with the *language in which the canonical Gospels were written*.[45][24]

References

1. Joseph A. Fitzmyer. “Did Jesus Speak Greek?” Biblical Archaeology Review 18, 5 (1992).
2. Languages and Scripts - The Dead Sea Scrolls - The Leon Levy Dead Sea Scrolls Digital Library offers an exceptional encounter with antiquity. Using...
3. Aramaic Literature in the Dead Sea Scrolls - Bible Odyssey - The 30 Aramaic texts in the Qumran library reveal the currents of thought that circulated more broad...
4. Hebrew or Aramaic? Some Evidence from Inscriptions - Even the word “Hebrew” in the New Testament, as well as in Josephus and Philo, was believed to refer...
5. Language Use in the First Century: Spoken Hebrew in a Trilingual ... - ... evidence on the whole goes to show that Hebrew ceased to be spoken in Palestine about 200 A.D.. ...
6. More on Why Jesus was a Hebrew speaker - In John 20, Mary Magdalene is described as calling the resurrected Jesus “rabbuni,” which, every sta...

7. Language in First Century Israel - Bible.org Blogs - Joseph Fitzmyer long ago discussed various archeological finds from the region and period that show ...
8. What is Aramaic Primacy? - Got Questions - Peshitta Primacy, or Aramaic Primacy, is not supported by evidence or scholarship. Despite the tradi...
9. George Lamsa - Wikipedia - A native Aramaic speaker, he translated the Aramaic Peshitta Old and New Testaments into English. He...
10. Holy Bible - Aramaic Translation by George M. Lamsa - The Lamsa bible is now presented in a handsome new edition: the classic version of The Holy Bible as...
11. Lamsa Bible: The Holy Bible from Ancient Eastern Manuscripts - The translation by George Lamsa from the Aramaic Peshitta, entitled The Holy Bible from Ancient East...
12. Peshitta - UBC Open Collections
13. PESHITTA | PDF | Bible | Religious Texts - Scribd - The Peshitta is the oldest biblical version in Syriac. It dates back to the 2nd century and consists...
14. Page:The New Testament in the original Greek - 1881.djvu/46
15. Ancient Syriac New Testament Versions
16. Aramaic New Testament hypotheses - Wikipedia - In current scholarship they enjoy no notable support compared to the consensus hypothesis that the N...
17. An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts - Matthew Black - The New Testament was preserved in Greek, but the events narrated in the Gospels and part of Acts to...
18. An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts - Google Books - Matthew Black therefore begins with the hypothesis that the material contained in these books was sp...
19. Is it true Mark has the most Aramaic Semitisisms than any other work ... - The general assessment among academics who have experiences in the relevant languages is that Mark h...
20. An Aramaic Approach to Q: Sources for the Gospels of Matthew and ... - Maurice Casey reconstructs sources of Q: material found in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke (and not ...
21. "Make a Path": Maurice Casey's evidence of an Aramaic source for ... - Maurice Casey argues that the author of the Gospel of Mark translated written Aramaic sources about ...
22. Maurice CASEY: An Aramaic Approach to Q. - Catholic Books Review - Casey concludes that Q scholarship had reached a "regrettably bureaucratised state" (50), and that "...
23. Aramaic sources in Mark and Q? : r/AcademicBiblical - Reddit - I have seen theories suggesting that the authors of the Gospel attributed to Mark and the Q source d...
24. Guide to Reference Resources: Biblical Studies - LibGuides - ... Greek word in the original text. These numbers make it easy to look ... Matera, Frank J. II Cori...
25. The Hebrew Gospel and the Development of the Synoptic Tradition - Edwards, of the faculty of Whitworth University, Spokane, Washington, claims Matthew wrote his Gospe...
26. The Hebrew Gospel & the Development of the Synoptic Tradition ... - Some scholars, myself included, believe the Hebrew Gospel derived from the hand of the apostle Matth...

27. Whitworth professor of theology releases groundbreaking new book ... - James Edwards challenges long-held "Q hypothesis," asserts existence of a Hebrew gospel Whitworth Pr...
28. A Fourteenth Century Text in which Jesus Taught the Kingdom of ... - The 14th century polemical treatise Even Bohan written by Shem-Tob ben Shaprut contains a Hebrew ver...
29. 1.0 Shem-Tob's Even Bohan and Its Hebrew Matthew - The focus of our study, Howard's Hebrew Gospel of Matthew, is a revised, second edition of a work or...
30. Hebrew Gospel of MATTHEW by George Howard - Part One.pdf - Hebrew Gospel of Matthew by George Howard Professor of Religion University of Georgia A leaffrom She...
31. Was The Gospel of Matthew Originally Written In Hebrew? - New evidence indicates that the Gospel of Matthew was an original Hebrew composition. Indeed, it is ...
32. Matthew's Hebrew Gospel - Mark Haughwout - This paper discusses evidence for the Gospel of Matthew originally being written in Hebrew and not A...
33. Was Matthew's Gospel First Written in Aramaic or Hebrew? - There is no evidence of an Aramaic or Hebrew original of Matthew's Gospel, it is futile to argue tha...
34. Was the New Testament Written in Hebrew, Aramaic, or Greek? - Indeed, there is no evidence that any early Jewish or Christian writer ever actually had access to a...
35. The Myth of an Aramaic Original New Testament - Dr. Michael Heiser - Aramaic New Testaments from antiquity are all translations made a couple centuries or so after the N...
36. What Are the Syriac Versions, and How Have They Helped to ... - Syria was a region with the Mesopotamia to its East, with the Lebanon Mountains on the West, the Tau...
37. Aramaic Primacy? : r/AcademicBiblical - Reddit - I don't understand Aramaic at all and know very little about Koine Greek ... gospels he used were wr...
38. Did Jesus or Apostles quote from the Septuagint? : r/Reformed - There are several pre-AD recensions of original LXX translations ... LXX when quoting him since they...
39. Papias Statement About The Gospel: Logia Logia Logia | PDF - Scribd - Scribd is the world's largest social reading and publishing site.
40. Matthew's Authorship of a Hebrew and Greek Gospel: More Evidence
41. Matthew, Gospel According to - Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible - MATTHEW, GOSPEL ACCORDING TO. 1. The First Gospel in the Early Church . Papias (c [Note: circa, abo...
42. Was There an Original Semitic Gospel? - Ad Fontes - For the earliest clue, Irenaeus (c. 190) knows of (what he believes to be) a heretical adaption of M...
43. The Story of Gospel According to Matthew - Gospel According to Matthew refers to:—1. The First Gospel in the Early Church. Papias (c [Note: ci...
44. Why is the Gospel of the Hebrews ignored by scholars? - The Blogs - There is a minority view of those who think they were written in Hebrew, which is partly based on th...
45. Aramaic Sources of Mark's Gospel. Society for New Testament ... - The phrase “Aramaic substrata of the Gospels” is bandied about by many, but the number of people act...

46. An Approach To the New Testament Through Aramaic Sources - Fitzmyer's following publications: 'Methodology in the Study of the Aramaic Substratum of Jesus' Say...
47. A History of Research on the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls
48. Historicity of the Gospels - Wikipedia - The consensus among scholars is that Jesus spoke Aramaic, whereas the canonical gospels were all ori...